

February 12, 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

/s/  
FROM: KAY COLES JAMES  
Director

SUBJECT: Reporting SES Performance Ratings and Awards for FY 2003

On several occasions in the past, I have issued updated information concerning past Senior Executive Service (SES) performance ratings and awards, as well as guidance encouraging agency leaders to use those data to support moving away from a performance culture where every executive is rated at the highest level. I take this occasion to provide you in the attached charts with a summary of the SES ratings and awards information for fiscal year 2002, as well as fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for comparison, and to call on you to provide your ratings and awards data for fiscal year 2003. The data indicate a growing number of agencies have taken seriously the need to improve the distribution of SES ratings and awards to support the high performance culture the President is determined to establish. However, these data also suggest that more work has still been required, and we will be extremely interested in the information you report for fiscal year 2003. The necessity for more rigorous and realistic ratings is especially clear in instances where agencies are not fulfilling their missions and reporting demonstrable results. The President, the Congress, and the American people expect the ratings and rewards that Federal executives receive to be commensurate with the results they have achieved.

As you know, the Administration and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) have successfully engaged in a series of sweeping SES pay and performance reforms. As of January 2004, a new performance-based pay system is in effect for members of the SES. Among other things, the system allows significantly higher base pay rates for the best performing SES members, and in so doing, can significantly strengthen the linkage between agency performance and executive compensation. Achieving that linkage requires agencies to use performance appraisal systems that rely on credible and rigorous performance measurements to make meaningful distinctions based on relative performance, as the law requires. OPM staff is available to consult with your agency Performance Review Boards, and executive resources management staff concerning the implementation of results-oriented performance measures for senior executives.

For many years, OPM has collected information on SES members' performance ratings and awards. Over the past several years, this information has been used to assess your agency's success in meeting certain performance management goals in the *President's Management Agenda*. In addition, it permits the longitudinal analysis of performance statistics conducted by OPM as part of its Governmentwide oversight responsibility. Your assistance and cooperation in reporting last year's SES performance ratings and awards information was greatly appreciated.

For fiscal year 2003, SES performance ratings will again be an important indicator of the Administration's efforts to promote a government that is results-oriented, citizen-centered, and market-based, as well as agencies' readiness to move forward with the SES performance-based pay system. Therefore, it is essential that Federal agencies provide complete, accurate, and current data on SES ratings and awards and that the data consolidate the program information for their subordinate components.

The forms necessary for reporting ratings and awards for SES rating periods that ended in fiscal year 2003 are attached. Also attached are detailed instructions on how to complete these forms. Please note that these reports must be completed by the department/agency SES contact; we cannot accept reports directly from component organizations. Once again, we are asking for separate data concerning Inspector General ratings and awards, as well as the actual percentage of aggregate base salary used to fund the bonus pool for the 2003 awards. We are also requesting that departments/agencies provide **aggregate data** for each SES summary level pattern permitted under their SES performance management system (i.e., 3-level, 4-level, and/or 5-level).

Please submit your reports of fiscal year 2003 ratings and awards immediately following receipt of this memorandum. If your department/agency granted no awards, please report the summary ratings. Please send your report(s) to Ms. Delores Everett in the Division for Strategic Human Resources Policy at:

U.S. Office of Personnel Management  
Division for Strategic Human Resources Policy  
Office of Leadership and Executive Resources Policy, Room 6500  
1900 E Street, NW.  
Washington, DC 20415-5100

You may also FAX your report(s) to (202) 606-1637.

For additional guidance about SES performance ratings and awards, Chief Human Capital Officers and Human Resources Directors should contact Mr. Hughes Turner, Deputy Associate Director for Leadership and Executive Resources Policy at (202) 606-1811. Staff inquiries should be referred to the appropriate OPM Human Capital Officer.

Attachments:  
(as stated)

cc: President's Management Council  
Chief Human Capital Officers  
Human Resources Directors

## **SUMMARY SES PERFORMANCE STATISTICS FY 2001 AND FY 2002**

- The number of career SES members decreased from **6118** in FY2001 to **5960** in FY2002.
- The number of career SES members who received a performance rating decreased from **5927** in FY2001 to **5626** in 2002.
- The percentage of career SES members rated at the highest level (either 3-level, 4-level or 5-level system) decreased from **84%** in FY2001 to **74.6%** in FY2002.
  - **1587**, or 38% are in 3-level systems (1 Unsatisfactory, 2 Minimally Satisfactory, 3 Fully Satisfactory )
  - **198**, or 5% are in 4-level systems (1 Unsatisfactory, 2 Minimally Satisfactory, 3 Fully Satisfactory, 4 Exceeds Expectations )
  - **2416**, or 57% are in 5-level systems (1 Unsatisfactory, 2 Minimally Satisfactory, 3 Fully Satisfactory, 4 Exceeds Expectations, 5 Superior and Far Exceeds Expectations )
- The number of career SES members eligible to receive a performance award decreased from **5915** in FY2001 to **5597** in FY2002.
- The percentage of eligible career SES members who received a performance award decreased from **52%** in FY2001 to **50%** in FY2002.
- The number of SES performance awards issued decreased from **3070** in FY2001 to **2754** in FY2002.
- The total amount paid for SES performance awards decreased from **\$37.84** million in FY2001 to **\$37.2** million in FY2002.
- The average performance award paid increased from **\$12,324** in FY2001 to **\$12,444** in FY2002.

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FY 2003 REPORT ON SES PERFORMANCE RATINGS AND AWARDS**

### **General Instructions**

The SES Performance Ratings and Awards Distribution Report is a two-part report that each department/agency provides to OPM after the end of their annual SES performance appraisal cycle. The department/agency should submit the report to the Center for leadership and Executive Resources Policy (L&ERP) within 30 days after the department/agency head (or designee) makes final award/bonus determinations or, if no awards/bonuses are paid, within 30 days after final performance ratings are assigned. Please note these reports are completed by the department/agency SES contact; we cannot accept reports directly from component organizations.

Executives covered by this report:

- *For performance awards*, SES career appointees and Presidential appointees who are former career appointees and who retained eligibility for performance awards.
- *For performance ratings*, SES career, noncareer, and limited appointees and Presidential appointees who are former career appointees and who retained eligibility for performance awards.

**If a department/agency operates more than one SES performance program plan (e.g. different rating cycles, different rating patterns, etc.) it should submit a separate report for each plan. For example, if one component uses a July 1 to June 30 cycle and another uses an October 1 to September 30 cycle, the department/agency should submit a separate report for each separate cycle. Similarly, if some components use a 3-level rating pattern and others use a 5-level rating pattern, the department/agency should submit reports for each separate rating pattern. Use a separate form for each SES performance program plan. Please do not combine the results from different program plans on a single form, except when providing aggregate data (see below).**

**Departments/agencies should also aggregate (i.e. roll-up) rating and award/bonus information for each SES rating pattern permitted under their department/agency SES performance management system (e.g. 3-level, 4-level and/or 5-level). For instance, if a department/agency operates multiple SES performance program plans using 3-level, 4-level and 5-level rating patterns, it should provide reports on each plan AND provide an aggregate of the 3-level, 4-level and 5-level plans at the department-level.**

**Once again, this year we are requesting that departments/agencies provide separate information concerning the number of SES ratings and awards issued to their Inspector General (IG) offices. Although, we recognize these subcomponents are generally included within the reports of your other SES performance program plans, we require separate IG information to address questions concerning the distribution of SES ratings and awards across the Federal Government.**

**Please complete (1) one form for each SES performance program plan; (2) one form to aggregate information for each rating pattern permitted by your department's/agency's SES performance management system (e.g. 3-level, 4-level and/or 5-level); and (3) one form for ratings and awards/bonuses issued to your IG offices.**

## **PART 1 - STATISTICAL SUMMARY**

The first part of the report is a statistical summary of SES performance ratings and awards. The report forms for this summary are attached to these instructions. If your department's/agency's award pool is based on a percentage of the aggregate base pay\* for career SES appointees, you should use OPM Form 1558. If your department's/agency's award pool is based on 20 percent of the average annual rates of base pay\* for career SES appointees, you should use OPM Form 1558A. (Please note that the 20% method will produce a larger pool only if your organization has one career SES member.)

**\* This is basic pay only; it does not include locality pay.**

The summary report includes the following information:

- Appraisal period begin and end dates (month, day, and year) and date (month and year) awards are paid.
- Total number of SES career appointees at each pay level **and** the aggregate base pay.\*\*
- Size of the award pool **and** the percentage of aggregate base pay on which it was calculated.\*\*
- Total dollar amount of award payments **and** the percentage of aggregate base pay actually used.\*\*
- Number of awardees at each percentage level of base pay.\*\*
- Total number of awardees.\*\*
- Total number of SES career, noncareer, and limited appointees at the end of the rating period
- Highest possible rating under the SES performance appraisal plan.
- Total number of SES career, noncareer, and limited appointees rated at each performance rating level.

**\*\* Leave blank if no awards are paid.**

## PART 2 - SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The second part of the report is supplementary information for **each executive** who received a less than fully successful performance rating (i.e., minimally satisfactory or unsatisfactory). The Supplementary Information Form is attached to these instructions. The following information is requested.

- Name and social security number of the executive.
- The performance rating the executive received.
- The date of final performance rating.
- Whether there was a pay decrease as a result of the rating.
- Any action taken as a result of the rating and the date of that action--for example, reassignment to another SES position, removal from the SES and placement in a GS-15 position, optional retirement, discontinued service retirement, resignation, etc. If the individual was placed in a position outside the SES, indicate whether this was for:
  - one unsatisfactory rating,
  - two unsatisfactory ratings in 5 years, or
  - two less than fully successful ratings in 3 years.

# SES PERFORMANCE RATINGS AND AWARDS DISTRIBUTION FY 2003

(Based on Percentage of Aggregate Career SES Base Pay)

<b>1. Department/Agency</b>		<b>2. Appraisal Period</b> (mm/dd/yy) From To		<b>3. Awards Paid or to be Paid</b> (Month and Year)	
<b>4. Aggregate career SES base pay as of the end of the fiscal year preceding payment, i.e., September 30, 19__.</b>					
PAY RATE		NO. OF CAREER APPOINTEES		BASE PAY	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
Presidential Appointee					
AGGREGATE					
<b>5. Award Pool =</b> .10 x \$ (aggregate base pay) and \$			<b>6. Total Award Payments =</b> _____% x \$ (aggregate base pay) and \$		
<b>7. NUMBER OF AWARDEES AT EACH PERCENTAGE LEVEL OF BASE PAY</b>					
PERCENTAGE LEVEL			NUMBER OF AWARDEES		
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
TOTAL					
<b>8. TOTAL AWARDEES</b> (from Item 7) = _____ or _____ % total number career appointees as of the end of the appraisal period as shown in Item 2.					
<b>9. TOTAL NUMBER OF SES APPOINTEES AT END OF RATING PERIOD</b>		Career	Noncareer	Limited	
<b>10. NUMBER OF SES PERFORMANCE RATINGS</b>					
RATING LEVEL	Put an "X" at the highest possible rating	NUMBER RATED			
		Career	Noncareer	Limited	
1 (Unsatisfactory)					
2 (Minimally Satisfactory)					
3 (Fully Successful)					
4					
5					
TOTAL					

# **SES PERFORMANCE RATINGS AND AWARDS DISTRIBUTION FY 2003**

*(Based on 20% of Average Career SES Base Pay)*

<b>1. Department/Agency</b>		<b>2. Appraisal Period</b> (mm/dd/yy) From            To		<b>3. Award Paid or to be Paid</b> <i>(Month and Year)</i>	
<b>4. Average career SES base pay as of the end of the fiscal year preceding payment, i.e., September 30, 19__.</b>					
PAY RATE	NO. OF CAREER APPOINTEES	BASE PAY	TOTAL BASE PAY		
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
Presidential Appointee					
TOTAL					
<b>5. Award Pool =</b> .20 x \$ _____ <i>(average base pay)</i> and \$ _____		<b>6. Total Award Payments =</b> .____ % x \$ _____ <i>(average base pay)</i> and \$ _____			
<b>7. NUMBER OF AWARDEES AT EACH PERCENTAGE LEVEL OF BASE PAY</b>					
PERCENTAGE LEVEL		NUMBER OF AWARDEES			
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
TOTAL					
<b>8. TOTAL AWARDEES</b> <i>(from Item 7)</i> = _____ or _____ % total number career appointees as of the end of the appraisal period as shown in Item 2.					
<b>9. TOTAL NUMBER OF SES APPOINTEES AT END OF RATING PERIOD</b>		Career	Noncareer	Limited	
<b>10. NUMBER OF SES PERFORMANCE RATINGS</b>					
RATING LEVEL	Put an "X" at the highest possible rating	NUMBER RATED			
		Career	Noncareer	Limited	
1 (Unsatisfactory)					
2 (Minimally Satisfactory)					
3 (Fully Successful)					
4					
5					
TOTAL					



## SES PERFORMANCE RATINGS AND AWARDS REPORT SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR FY 2003

The following Supplementary Information is requested for executives who received less than fully successful performance ratings.

Department/Agency

Performance Appraisal Period Ending (MM/DD/YY)

[illegible]

# SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

## Career SES Performance Ratings FY 2000, FY 2001 and FY 2002 (All Systems)

AGENCY	Career SES Rated FY 2000	FY00 % at Highest Level	Career SES Rated FY 2001	FY01 % at Highest Level	FY 00-01 % Change	Career SES Rated FY 2002	FY02 % at Highest Level	FY 01-02 % Change
AGRICULTURE	269	35.3%	278	36.0%	0.7%	296	34.5%	-1.5%
AID	19	94.7%	19	78.9%	-15.8%	19	42.1%	-36.8%
COMMERCE	218	88.1%	259	79.9%	-8.2%	215	80.5%	0.6%
DEFENSE	1098	99.0%	1134	98.9%	-0.1%	1,002	96.5%	-2.4%
EDUCATION	51	100.0%	60	100.0%	0.0%	63	100.0%	0.0%
ENERGY	347	100.0%	386	99.0%	-1.0%	343	18.4%	-80.6%
EPA	239	85.4%	235	84.7%	-0.7%	242	68.6%	-16.1%
FEMA	29	89.7%	29	31.0%	-58.6%	28	0.0%	-31.0%
GSA	74	95.9%	77	92.2%	-3.7%	76	52.5%	-39.7%
HHS	357	90.2%	357	90.8%	0.6%	342	99.1%	8.3%
HUD	66	100.0%	68	98.5%	-1.5%	64	100.0%	1.5%
INTERIOR	178	100.0%	185	100.0%	0.0%	185	99.5%	-0.5%
JUSTICE	287	91.3%	295	91.2%	-0.1%	258	87.6%	-3.6%
LABOR	131	68.7%	129	60.5%	-8.2%	124	48.4%	-12.1%
NASA	377	73.2%	378	75.9%	2.7%	358	75.7%	-0.2%
NRC	133	100.0%	136	100.0%	0.0%	140	98.6%	-1.4%
OMB	51	88.0%	46	19.5%	-68.6%	53	24.5%	5.0%
OPM	30	90.0%	27	37.0%	-53.0%	22	45.5%	8.5%
SBA	29	79.3%	33	81.8%	2.5%	34	50.0%	-31.8%
SOCIAL SECURITY	115	100.0%	114	100.0%	0.0%	116	100.0%	0.0%
STATE	95	100.0%	91	100.0%	0.0%	111	99.1%	-0.9%
TRANSPORTATION	165	99.4%	193	99.5%	0.1%	175	100.0%	0.5%
TREASURY	521	66.0%	532	62.8%	-3.2%	533	59.1%	-3.7%
VETERANS AFFAIRS	254	55.9%	269	56.1%	0.2%	270	57.0%	0.9%
All Others	657	88.3%	597	82.7%	-5.5%	557	75.5%	-7.2%
<b>Governmentwide</b>	<b>5790</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>5927</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>-1.8%</b>	<b>5,626</b>	<b>74.6%</b>	<b>-9.1%</b>

Note: Inspector General (IG) ratings included with All Others  
Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558

**SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE**  
**Career SES Performance Ratings FY 2000, FY 2001 and FY 2002**  
**(5-Level Systems in 2002)**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>Career SES Rated FY 2000</b>	<b>% at Highest Level</b>	<b>Career SES Rated FY 2001</b>	<b>% at Highest Level</b>	<b>FY00-01 % Change</b>	<b>Career SES Rated FY 2002</b>	<b>% at Highest Level</b>	<b>FY01-02 % Change</b>
AGRICULTURE	269	35.3%	278	36.0%	0.7%	296	34.5%	-1.5%
AID	19	94.7%	19	78.9%	-15.8%	19	42.1%	-36.8%
COMMERCE	218	88.1%	259	79.9%	-8.2%	215	80.5%	0.6%
DEFENSE (Military Agencies)	695	98.4%	725	98.6%	0.2%	604	94.5%	-4.1%
EPA	239	85.4%	235	84.7%	-0.7%	242	68.6%	-16.1%
GSA	74	95.9%	77	92.2%	-3.7%	76	52.5%	-39.7%
JUSTICE	287	91.3%	295	91.2%	-0.1%	258	87.6%	-3.6%
LABOR	131	68.7%	129	60.5%	-8.2%	124	48.4%	-12.1%
NASA	377	73.2%	378	75.9%	2.7%	358	75.7%	-0.2%
OPM	30	90.0%	27	37.0%	-53.0%	22	45.5%	8.5%
SBA	29	79.3%	33	81.8%	2.5%	34	50.0%	-31.8%
TREASURY	459	61.4%	467	57.6%	-3.8%	425	48.7%	-8.9%
VETERANS AFFAIRS	254	55.9%	269	56.1%	0.2%	270	57.0%	0.9%
All Others	603	86.2%	543	79.6%	-6.7%	544	80.5%	0.9%
<b>Governmentwide</b>	<b>3684</b>	<b>78.7%</b>	<b>3734</b>	<b>75.9%</b>	<b>-2.8%</b>	<b>3487</b>	<b>69.2%</b>	<b>-6.7%</b>

Note: Inspector General (IG) ratings included with All Others  
Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558

**SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE**  
**Career SES Performance Ratings FY 2000, FY 2001 and FY 2002**  
**(4-Level Systems in 2002)**

AGENCY	Career SES Rated FY 2000	% at Highest Level	Career SES Rated FY 2001	% at Highest Level	Career SES Rated FY 2002	% at Highest Level	FY 01-02 % Change
ENERGY	347	100.0%	386	99.0%	343	18.4%	80.6%
FEMA	29	89.7%	29	31.0%	28	0.0%	-31.0%
MSPB	9	100.0%	9	89.0%	9	100.0%	11.0%
OMB	51	88.0%	46	20.0%	53	24.5%	4.5%
STATE	95	100.0%	91	100.0%	111	99.1%	0.9%
All Others	N/A		N/A		3	100.0%	N/A
Governmentwide	531	97.4%	561	88.6%	547	35.8%	-52.8%

Note: Inspector General (IG) ratings included with All Others  
Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558

**SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE**  
**Career SES Average Rating Levels - FY 2002**  
**(3-Level Systems in 2002)**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>Career SES Rated FY 2002</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Average Rating</b>
DEFENSE (OSD only)	398	1	0	397	3.0
EDUCATION	63	0	0	63	3.0
HHS	308	0	1	307	3.0
HUD	64	0	0	64	3.0
INTERIOR	185	1	0	184	3.0
NRC	140	0	2	138	3.0
SOCIAL SECURITY	116	0	0	116	3.0
TRANSPORTATION	175	0	0	175	3.0
All Others	143	0	0	143	3.0
<b>Governmentwide</b>	<b>1592</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1587</b>	<b>3.0</b>

Note: Inspector General (IG) ratings included with All Others  
Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558

**SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE**  
**Career SES Average Rating Levels - FY 2002**  
**(5-Level Systems in 2002)**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>Career SES Rated FY 2002</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>AVERAGE RATING</b>
AGRICULTURE	296	0	0	22	172	102	4.3
AID	19	0	0	5	6	8	4.2
COMMERCE	215	0	0	6	36	173	4.8
DEFENSE (Military Agencies)	604	1	0	3	29	571	4.9
EPA	242	0	1	4	71	166	4.7
GSA	76	0	0	7	31	38	4.4
JUSTICE	258	0	0	4	28	226	4.9
LABOR	124	0	0	13	51	60	4.4
NASA	358	0	2	11	74	271	4.7
OPM	22	0	0	1	11	10	4.4
SBA	34	0	0	7	10	17	4.3
TREASURY	425	0	0	53	165	207	4.4
VETERANS AFFAIRS	270	0	6	34	76	154	4.4
All Others	547	0	7	53	71	413	4.6
<b>Governmentwide</b>	<b>3,487</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>2416</b>	<b>4.6</b>

Note: Inspector General (IG) ratings included with All Others  
Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558

**SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE**  
**Career SES Average Rating Levels - FY 2002**  
**(4-Level Systems in 2002)**

AGENCY	Career SES Rated FY	1	2	3	4	AVERAGE RATING
	2002					
ENERGY	343	0	7	273	63	3.2
FEMA	28	0	0	28	0	3.0
MSPB	9	0	0	0	9	4.0
OMB	53	0	0	40	13	3.2
STATE	111	0	0	1	110	4.0
All Others	3	0	0	0	3	4.0
Governmentwide	547	0	7	342	198	3.3

Note: Inspector General (IG) ratings included with All Others  
Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558

**SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE**  
**Career SES Average Rating Levels - FY 2002**  
**(3-Level Systems in 2002)**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>Career SES Rated FY 2002</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Average Rating</b>
DEFENSE (OSD only)	398	1	0	397	3.0
EDUCATION	63	0	0	63	3.0
HHS	308	0	1	307	3.0
HUD	64	0	0	64	3.0
INTERIOR	185	1	0	184	3.0
NRC	140	0	2	138	3.0
SOCIAL SECURITY	116	0	0	116	3.0
TRANSPORTATION	175	0	0	175	3.0
All Others	143	0	0	143	3.0
<b>Governmentwide</b>	<b>1592</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1587</b>	<b>3.0</b>

Note: Inspector General (IG) ratings included with All Others  
Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558



# SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

## Career SES Awards Issued - FY 2001 and FY 2002 (All Systems)

AGENCY	Career Eligibles FY 2001	FY01 % Rated Highest Level	Bonuses Issued	Average Award	% Awarded	% Change from FY 2000	Career Eligibles FY 2002	FY02 % Rated Highest Level	Bonuses Issued	Average Award	% Awarded	% Change from FY 2001
AGRICULTURE	278	36.0%	174	\$11,149	62.6%	1.3%	296	34.5%	209	\$11,153	70.6%	8.0%
AID	19	78.9%	9	\$8,485	47.4%	0.0%	19	42.1%	8	\$7,442	42.1%	-5.3%
COMMERCE	259	79.9%	172	\$10,988	66.4%	-12.9%	215	80.5%	178	\$10,616	82.8%	16.4%
DEFENSE	1131	98.9%	608	\$16,665	53.8%	-0.5%	1000	96.5%	205	\$15,732	20.5%	-33.3%
EDUCATION	60	100.0%	40	\$11,855	66.7%	-5.9%	63	100.0%	38	\$10,302	60.3%	-6.4%
ENERGY	382	99.0%	149	\$7,730	39.0%	-14.9%	343	18.4%	142	\$9,793	41.4%	2.4%
EPA	235	84.7%	82	\$9,777	34.9%	1.0%	241	68.6%	93	\$15,518	38.6%	3.7%
FEMA	29	31.0%	8	\$12,396	27.6%	-10.3%	28	0.0%	4	\$6,553	14.3%	-13.3%
GSA	77	92.2%	61	\$12,455	79.2%	3.5%	76	52.5%	72	\$12,003	94.7%	15.5%
HHS	357	90.8%	123	\$10,348	34.5%	-23.2%	342	99.1%	127	\$10,307	37.1%	2.6%
HUD	67	98.5%	36	\$8,542	53.7%	-41.7%	64	100.0%	33	\$8,515	51.6%	-2.1%
INTERIOR	185	100.0%	39	\$8,669	21.1%	-2.0%	184	99.5%	60	\$10,243	32.6%	11.5%
JUSTICE	295	91.2%	119	\$10,454	40.3%	-0.1%	258	87.6%	109	\$9,991	42.2%	1.9%
LABOR	129	60.5%	105	\$11,741	81.4%	14.2%	124	48.4%	116	\$10,918	93.5%	12.1%
NASA	377	75.9%	145	\$10,781	38.5%	0.7%	356	75.7%	145	\$12,084	40.7%	2.2%
NRC	136	100.0%	111	\$13,919	81.6%	7.9%	140	98.6%	110	\$14,699	78.6%	-3.0%
OMB	46	19.5%	25	\$11,664	54.0%	-8.7%	53	24.5%	22	\$12,500	41.5%	-12.5%
OPM	27	37.0%	23	\$13,695	85.2%	-1.5%	22	45.5%	20	\$13,266	90.9%	5.7%
SBA	33	81.8%	29	\$13,138	87.9%	8.6%	34	50.0%	28	\$15,000	82.4%	-5.5%
SOCIAL SECURITY	114	100.0%	44	\$9,000	38.6%	3.8%	116	100.0%	46	\$12,604	39.7%	1.1%
STATE	91	100.0%	40	\$10,938	44.0%	0.8%	111	99.1%	39	\$11,026	35.1%	-8.9%
TRANSPORTATION	192	99.5%	86	\$9,409	44.8%	-4.0%	175	100.0%	80	\$10,541	45.7%	0.9%
TREASURY	532	62.8%	292	\$13,919	54.9%	2.3%	533	59.1%	292	\$15,114	54.8%	-0.1%
VETERANS AFFAIRS	267	56.1%	188	\$14,012	70.4%	12.6%	264	57.0%	197	\$8,120	74.6%	4.2%
All Others	597	82.7%	362	\$10,258	60.2%	5.4%	540	83.6%	381	\$12,444	70.6%	10.4%
<b>Governmentwide</b>	<b>5915</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>3070</b>	<b>\$12,324</b>	<b>51.9%</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>	<b>5597</b>	<b>74.6%</b>	<b>2754</b>	<b>\$12,444</b>	<b>49.2%</b>	<b>-2.7%</b>

Note: Inspector General (IG) awards included with All Others

Source: Annual Agency Reports on OPM Form 1558